

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The amendments set forth above and the following remarks are responsive to the points raised by the Office Action dated June 24, 2010. In view of the amendments set forth above and the following remarks, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The Pending Claims

Claims 1-12 remain pending. Claims 1 and 9 are amended to describe the invention more clearly. No new matter is added, and support for the amended claim language may be found within the specification, claims, and drawings. Support for claims 1 and 9 may be found in the specification at, e.g., Figure 3.

The Office Action

Claims 1-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0155479 to Kishi et al. (hereinafter, "Kishi") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,946,988 to Edwards et al. (hereinafter, "Edwards").

This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Office Action correctly acknowledges that Kishi fails to disclose a device having a wireless link. According to the Office Action, Edwards discloses in column 4, lines 24-39 the use of two pairs of transceivers (transmitters and receivers). The Office Action states that while Edwards discloses the use of two pairs of transmitters and receivers, only one pair is used at a time, and that transceiver 57 is used when the controller is detached from the player, and transceiver 61 is used when the controller is docked with the player. The Office Action concludes that the wireless link (when the controller is removed from the player) only uses a single pair of transmitter and receiver (transceiver 57) to establish the wireless link.

Amended claims 1 and 9 more clearly recite that the device itself has only "a single transmitter and a single receiver." In other words, the claimed equipment has only a single transmitter and a single receiver which establish a wireless link for both of the attached and removed conditions of the claimed equipment.

The use of a single transmitter and a single receiver, as claimed, has numerous advantages, including greater simplicity and a reduction in the number of components used in the device. In addition, as explained in the specification, the wireless link provided by a *single* transmitter (410/410') and a *single* receiver (420/420') advantageously enables the *same* communication channel to be used between the control panel (200) and the playing mechanism (300) so that the communication channel does not need to be changed or switched when the panel (200) is attached to or removed from the chassis (100). Furthermore, no electrical contact is required (specification, e.g., page 7, line 19 to page 8, line 3).

The combination of Kishi and Edwards fails to teach or suggest a device that has "a single transmitter and a single receiver," as claimed in amended claims 1 and 9. Edwards' alleged teaching of merely *using* a single pair of transmitter and receiver at a time to establish a wireless link does not teach or suggest a *device* that *has* only "a single transmitter and a single receiver," as claimed in amended claims 1 and 9.

Contrary to the claimed "single transmitter and a single receiver," Edwards describes a device including a first infrared transmitter and a second infrared transmitter (Edwards, Abstract, col. 1, line 56 to col. 2, line 4; col. 3, lines 42-46; col. 4, lines 24-39; col. 5, lines 29-45). Edwards claim 1 requires first and second infrared transmitters for use when the remote controller is docked and not docked, respectively. Claim 9 of Edwards requires the use of metal contacts when the remote controller is docked and an infrared transmitter when the remote controller is not docked. Claim 12 of Edwards requires a first infrared transmitter for use when the remote controller is docked, and claim 13 of Edwards adds a second infrared transmitter for use in the detached condition. Accordingly, unlike the claimed device, the device of Edwards does not use the same communication channel in the attached and removed conditions. Because the device of Edwards does not have only "a single transmitter and a single receiver," the device of Edwards does not provide all of the advantages described above. Because the combination of Kishi and Edwards fails to teach or suggest a device having only "a single transmitter and a single receiver," as claimed in amended claims 1 and 9, and because the Office Action fails to explain why "a single transmitter and a single receiver" would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, the obviousness rejection of amended claims 1 and 9 cannot be maintained.

Independent claims 1 and 9 are patentable for the reasons set forth above. The dependent claims are also patentable because they depend from and include the limitations of independent claims 1 and 9.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that the patent application is in condition for allowance. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

Stephanie M. Lawley
Stephanie M. Lawley, Reg. No. 65362
LEYDIG, VOIT & MAYER
700 Thirteenth Street, N.W., Suite 300
Washington, DC 20005-3960
(202) 737-6770 (telephone)
(202) 737-6776 (facsimile)

Date: Oct 20, 2010

Amendment or ROA - Regular (SML/mlg)